



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,678	09/30/2003	Gary Dean Anderson	ROC920030289US1	6756
30206	7590	01/25/2006	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			FAROOQ, MOHAMMAD O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/675,678	Applicant(s) ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Mohammad O. Farooq	Art Unit 2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-13, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 11 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: both of these claims state "wherein the method is...". However, claim 10 is not a method claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopelovitz et al. U.S. Pub. No. US 2002/0138604 in view of Faddell et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,938,742..

3. As to claim 1, Kopelovitz et al. teach method, the method comprising:
reading a cable identifier (path attributes) of an interconnection cable connecting components in the computing environment (abstract; paragraph 0027); and
storing the cable identifier (path attributes) of the interconnection cable in a software object (database) within the computing environment.

Kopelovitz et al. do not teach adjusting port speeds of components connected by the interconnection cable. Faddell et al. teach adjusting port speeds of components (peripheral devices) connected by the interconnection cable (col. 45, lines 47-58). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Kopelovitz et al. and Faddell et al. because that would provide serial bus to reconfigure attached peripheral device without any action on the part of the user (col. 7, lines 5-17).

4. As to claims 2 and 3, Kopelovitz et al. do not teach method is triggered upon system bring-up and during run time.

Faddell et al. teach method is triggered upon system bring-up (power-up; col. 2, lines 30-42) and during run time (hot plugging; col. 2, lines 25-30). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Kopelovitz et al. and Faddell et al. because that would provide serial bus to reconfigure attached peripheral device without any action on the part of the user (col. 7, lines 5-17).

5. As to claims 4 and 5, Kopelovitz et al. teach method, wherein the cable identifier contains the length of the cable (length of the fiber; paragraph 0027) and the type of the associated interconnection cable (paragraph 0024).

6. As to claims 8 and 9, Kopelovitz et al. teach method, wherein at least one of the components is a logically partitioned computer system (database; abstract) and is an I/O enclosure (any one of I/O in a node of a network; paragraph 0002).

Art Unit: 2181

7. As to claim 10, Kopelovitz et al. teach computer readable program, configured to perform the steps of:

Reading a cable identifier (path attributes) of an interconnection cable connecting components in the computing environment (abstract; paragraph 0027); and

Storing the cable identifier (path attributes) of the interconnection cable in a software object (database) within the computing environment.

Kopelovitz et al. do not teach adjusting port speeds of components connected by the interconnection cable. Faddell et al. teach adjusting port speeds of components (peripheral devices) connected by the interconnection cable (col. 45, lines 47-58). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Kopelovitz et al. and Faddell et al. because that would provide serial bus to reconfigure attached peripheral device without any action on the part of the user (col. 7, lines 5-17).

8. Claims 11-13, 16 and 17 are computer readable program of apparatus claims 2-4, 8 and 9. Kopelovitz et al. and Faddell et al. in combination teach apparatus as set forth in claims 2-4, 8 and 9. Therefore, Kopelovitz et al. and Faddell et al. in combination also teach computer readable program as set forth in claims 11-13, 16 and 17.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed August 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner would like to point out that automatic input, as opposed to user input of the cable identifiers are not specifically stated in any of the limitations of any of the claims.

Furthermore, independent claims 1 and 10 state "reading a cable identifier of an interconnection cable...". However, it does not specifically point out where the cable identifiers are – within the cable itself or somewhere else in the computing environment. After considering all of the factors above, the examiner retains the rejection of the previously rejected claims.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2181

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad O. Farooq whose telephone number is (571) 272-4144. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached at (571) – 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad O. Farooq
January 19, 2006


HENRY W. H. TSAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/19/06